

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending in the instant application and stand rejected by the examiner. Claims 1 and 39 are independent claims. The assignee traverses the rejections of the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claims 1, 6-8, 21-27, 33-34, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Network Working Group RFC 2633 (June 1999) (Ramsdell). Claims 19-20 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell. Claims 2-5 and 40-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,853, issued to Klein (Klein). Also, claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell in view of Network Working Group RFC 1991 (August 1996) (Atkins). Claims 9-14, 16-17, 28-32, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,005, issued to Thorne, et al. (Thorne). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell in view of Thorne and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0121394, application of Kamen, et al. (Kamen). Finally, claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell in view of Thorne and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,316, issued to Carpenter, et al. (Carpenter). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 of the instant application recites a method of mimetic message settings selection on a messaging client. The method detects an outgoing message and determines whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message having message characteristics. If the outgoing message is related to a previously received message having message characteristics, then the messaging settings associated with the message characteristics of the related message

are determined and used to control the message characteristics of the outgoing message. As amended, claim 1 recites that the determination of whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message is based upon the outgoing message and the previously received content having at least a portion of message content in common or comprising a message thread. Support for these features include: the subject matter of claims 2 and 3 (which are directed to determining whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message based upon the outgoing message and the previously received message having at least a portion of message content in common); and the subject matter of claims 4 and 5 (which are directed to determining whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message based upon the outgoing message and the previously received message comprising a message thread).

None of the cited references (whether viewed alone or in combination with each other) disclose such subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. With respect to the other independent claim, claim 39 is amended herein with analogous subject matter as claim 1. Accordingly, for similar reasons as claim 1, claim 39 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the assignee respectfully requests that the examiner pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
Jones Day
North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 586-3939